

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of March 3, 2006.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

Brief summary of the embodiments

The subject developments relate to a document processing system in which multiple job renderings of essentially the same job data can be accomplished with a single submission of the job data to the system. More particularly, a master job control ticket causes a plurality of job processing events comprising the distinct renderings to be processed by linking respective job control tickets for the multiple renderings to the master job control ticket. The master job control ticket and individual job tickets have user selectable global attributes and user selectable individual ticket attributes and the linking of the global and individual ticket attributes enables the processing of the plurality of job processing events with a single submission. Image data can also be linked with each of the job processing events. A memory stores the tickets together with the image data so that the programming for the multiple renderings can be readily manipulated or edited.

The claims distinguish over the teachings of the references

The Hansen '974 reference which the Examiner relies upon in rejecting all of the pending claims describes a system for providing production printing instructions, i.e., a job ticket for a printed end document to a job preparation station. The Examiner has principally relied upon the teachings of this reference regarding the printed document comprising a plurality of documents of different content and document formatting. The system automatically converts the plurality of constituent documents into a ready-for-printer format and merges the plurality of documents together to create a single document in the ready-for-printer format. Hansen '974 is not unlike Applicants' cited reference to Salgado et al. '762 (see application, page 5) with regard to the formation of a print job comprising a "composite job".

It is important for the Examiner to note that Hansen '974 has no teaching with regard to multiple alternative renderings of the same job data, wherein the same job data is formatted differently to better accommodate the needs of different types of users of the job. Keeping in mind the ultimate purpose of the subject application, i.e., the

production of multiple distinct forms of a particular job without having to resubmit the job as a new and independent job for each of the distinct forms, the Hansen '974 lacks any teaching of a master job control ticket to affect the processing of the same job data in multiple renderings.

The Examiner correctly notes that Hansen teaches a job defining job ticket which can include global attributes for the plurality of documents comprising the composite job. However, there is no teaching that the global attributes should be included in a master job control ticket for multiple distinct renderings of the same job data. Each alternative rendering of the same job data would have to be treated as a new job having its own job ticket which would have to be resubmitted for independent processing. Accordingly, the principal disadvantage that is sought to be overcome in the embodiments of the subject application, i.e., a user having to resubmit any distinct renderings as a new job to the document processing, remains in the teachings of Hansen '974.

The Examiner will appreciate that the claims have been amended to more clearly emphasize that the system comprises a single submission of the job to affect the multiple processing of alternative renderings as first and second job processing events. The linking of the global and individual ticket attributes enables the processing of a plurality of job processing events with the single submission of the job to the document processing system.

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted that all claims remaining in the application (claims 1-8, 10-18, 28-38 and 40-49) are now in condition for allowance. Early notice thereof is respectfully requested. In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Patrick R. Roche, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

Sept. 5, 2006
Date

Patrick R. Roche
Patrick R. Roche, Reg. No. 29,580
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582